

VZCZCXYZ0000  
OO RUEHWEB

DE RUEHTC #1035/01 3540852  
ZNR UUUUU ZZH  
O 190852Z DEC 08  
FM AMEMBASSY THE HAGUE  
TO RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 2353  
INFO RUEAIIA/CIA WASHDC PRIORITY  
RUCPDO/DEPT OF COMMERCE WASHDC PRIORITY  
RHEBAAA/DEPT OF ENERGY WASHDC PRIORITY  
RUEKJCS/SECDEF WASHINGTON DC PRIORITY  
RHEHNSC/NSC WASHDC PRIORITY  
RUEKJCS/JOINT STAFF WASHDC PRIORITY  
RHMFIUU/DTRA ALEX WASHINGTON DC//OSAC PRIORITY

UNCLAS THE HAGUE 001035

SENSITIVE  
SIPDIS

STATE FOR ISN/CB, VCI/CCA, L/NPV, IO/MPR,  
SECDEF FOR OSD/GSA/CN,CP>  
JOINT STAFF FOR DD PMA-A FOR WTC  
COMMERCE FOR BIS (ROBERTS AND DENYER)  
NSC FOR FLY  
WINPAC FOR WALTER

E.O. 12958: N/A  
TAGS: [PARM](#) [PREL](#) [CWC](#)  
SUBJECT: CWC: WRAP UP FOR DECEMBER 8-18, 2008

REF: A. THE HAGUE 1015  
[1](#)B. THE HAGUE 1021  
[1](#)C. THE HAGUE 1025  
[1](#)D. THE HAGUE 984

This is CWC-63-08.

-----  
SUMMARY  
-----

[1](#)1. (SBU) During his brief visit December 8, A/DAS Kenneth Staley met with the Algerian Ambassador to discuss plans for a conference on chemical terrorism and security in Algeria next year. Delrep followed up later in the week with the Algerian delegate to OPCW; it appears that Algeria's concept for this conference is grander than what the U.S. had in mind.

[1](#)2. (SBU) The Western European and Others Group held its last meeting of the year on December 9, discussing the recent Conference of the States Parties (CSP-13) as well as bidding farewell to Ambassador Javits with contentious debate on a draft decision in his honor. Executive Council Chairperson Oksana Tomova hosted the U.S. delegation to breakfast on December 12, again to bid farewell to Ambassador Javits but also to discuss the recent CSP. Clingendael Institute featured Amb. Javits as a luncheon speaker as part of a series on multilateralism at the OPCW. Delreps met with counterparts from Japan and South Korea on December 18 to discuss possible reform of the Advisory Body on Administrative and Financial Matters.

-----  
A/DAS STALEY'S MEETING WITH ALGERIAN AMBASSADOR AND  
FOLLOW UP ON THE ALGERIAN CONFERENCE  
-----

[1](#)3. (SBU) On December 8, A/DAS Staley, ISN/CB Office Director Mikulak and Delreps met with Algerian Ambassador Benchaa Dani and delegate Said Moussi to discuss evolving plans for an Algerian conference on Chemical Terrorism and Safety and Security. Amb. Dani said Algiers was very enthusiastic about the

proposal, and was looking at hosting such an event in the second half of February. He suggested the event be held at the African Center for Studies and Research on Terrorism. A/DAS Staley expressed appreciation for Algeria's willingness to play a lead role in this area and suggested that Algeria consider a mid-March date for the conference to give a bit more time for thorough planning in Algiers and Washington.

¶4. (SBU) Staley recommended the conference maintain a regional focus; Dani replied that while he might agree with this approach for training, he thought a conference that had the potential to raise the profile of preventing chemical terrorism should target global participation. On conference format, Dani recommended organizing several round-table discussions on various topics to allow for a more in-depth exploration. Delrep suggested that discussions include chemical terrorism scenarios, as well as best practices on chemical plant security, and noted that the U.S. would provide a paper with initial thoughts on appropriate topics.

¶5. (SBU) Dani reminded others that the first stage of improving international prevention of chemical terrorism is raising awareness, and suggested again that this could best be done globally before focusing training efforts regionally. He expressed hope that the U.S. would provide expertise and financial contributions for the upcoming Conference, noting the Qcontributions for the upcoming Conference, noting the "total lack" of African expertise in this area.

¶6. (SBU) On December 11, Delrep met with Algerian delegate Moussi to share an informal U.S. paper on possible conference structure/topics and follow up on earlier discussions. It became increasingly clear over the course of this and a meeting on December 12 that Algeria views this conference as a far broader and more political event than Washington had envisioned. Algiers does not/not want to limit the scope to North and Central Africa, as outlined in the U.S. paper, but wants participation and speakers/expertise from around the world, including from other international organizations and bodies, such as the UN's 1540 Committee. Algiers also envisions an opening session with speeches from high-level officials from Algeria, the U.S. and the African Union, and attendance on the opening day by the Diplomatic Corps in Algiers.

¶7. (SBU) Algeria has not defined the appropriate role for the OPCW Technical Secretariat (TS), and was open to U.S. views. Moussi asked whether this should, instead, be an OPCW-sponsored event, with invitations coming from the Director-General (DG). Delrep cautioned that this would come with a number of complications and committed to seek Washington's views on the matter. Moussi also expanded on Algeria's concept of round-table discussions and suggested the results of these sessions could be reported back to the conference at the end in the form of working papers or suggestions for best practices.

¶8. (SBU) Moussi also reiterated the mutual benefit for both the U.S. and Algeria of raising the profile of prevention of chemical terrorism and went so far as to point to the political inroads this event could establish for the U.S. in terms of larger anti-terrorism goals on the African continent. He then went on to explain that Algeria sees the second step in this process as "capacity building," and noted that there would be value in equipping the African Center with an analytical laboratory but was not able to offer a satisfactory justification for this.

¶9. (SBU) DEL COMMENT: As Algeria clearly has grander designs than the U.S. for the upcoming conference, it will be important to share any U.S. response to these initial discussions as soon as possible. Otherwise, Algiers is likely to move ahead with planning and expect assistance for a highly political and complex event that may lack the practical impact Washington desires. Del recommends that any initial response include clear parameters in terms of the support (both expert and financial) the U.S. is willing to offer. This topic is also one that will attract attention from the OPCW Director of the Office of Special Projects and the Chair of the OPCW Open-ended Working Group on Terrorism, both of whom will be eager to influence the planning and scope of this conference. END COMMENT

-----  
WEOG  
-----

¶10. (SBU) The Western European and Others Group (WEOG) coordinator Ruth Surkau opened the last WEOG meeting of 2008 with a review of CSP-13. Delegations expressed mixed feelings, including appreciation for the continued trend of openness and transparency in the final negotiations, and concern that the budget of the final negotiations, and concern that the budget process in particular was being eroded by Non-aligned Movement (NAM) -- specifically Iranian -- "interpretation" and politicization. Amb. Javits noted that Iran had received an object lesson when the U.S. and others refused to accept proposed Iranian destruction language, despite the fact that this meant no consensus report was adopted. He also noted the increased importance of cross-regional cooperation, particularly to capitalize on growing frustration with Iranian tactics. UK Ambassador Lyn Parker added that Russia had become increasingly outspoken on non-proliferation, and that China was still "caught between two camps" but displaying a rational approach that others should encourage. However, Parker noted that India was still too closely aligned with Iran to be a useful or consistent partner.

¶11. (SBU) Ireland asked whether the lack of agreement on a report (as an alternative to reluctantly agreeing language that eroded WEOG objectives) could be an option for future situations. The Netherlands noted that Iran is likely to question the validity of future decisions, and expressed disappointment that India had continued to support Iran. Italian delegate Giuseppe Cornacchia was positive about the Conference outcome in terms of the lesson it may have provided for Iran, but he added that Iran relies heavily on a detailed knowledge of the rules of procedure and that WEOG might do well to research these rules more thoroughly for future sessions. Switzerland assessed the lack of a consensus report as "regrettable but necessary" and reminded delegations that any calls for a vote would need to come 24 hours before the end of the Conference, although voting rules for the Council may be somewhat more flexible.

¶12. (SBU) In a creative farewell gesture to Amb. Javits, Surkau asked WEOG members to stay for a discussion of a "Canadian proposal," which turned out to be a mock draft decision on Amb. Javits' departure. WEOG delegations, often acting in character as more troublesome NAM delegations, debated the language, ending the mock negotiation with text no closer to consensus than when they began.

-----  
BREAKFAST WITH SLOVAKIAN DELEGATION

-----  
¶13. (SBU) On December 12, Slovakian Ambassador Oksana Tomova (Executive Council Chairperson) hosted Amb. Javits to breakfast; Slovakian delegate Michal Komada and Delreps also attended. Amb. Tomova used the opportunity to bid farewell to Amb. Javits as well to share views on the future work of the Executive Council (EC). The discussion focused at length about the Iranian delegation's behavior at CSP-13 and possible spill-over effects at the next EC session in February 2009. Amb. Tomova noted the constructive roles played by Chinese Ambassador Zhang and Mexican Ambassador Lomonaco during the Conference; Amb. Javits agreed that it would be necessary to work across regional lines to deal with future Iranian obstruction. Amb. Tomova mentioned that the Iranian delegation had met with CSP Chairman Amb. Shibuya to protest his releasing a Chairman's report for the Conference. She did not have a read-out of the meeting; however, Komada pointed out that an advance copy of the report already had been released, despite any Iranian objections.

-----  
CLINGENDAEL HOSTS AMBASSADOR JAVITS  
-----

¶14. (U) On December 12, Clingendael Institute Q14. (U) On December 12, Clingendael Institute featured Amb. Javits as its featured lunch speaker on "Reflections on Multilateral Cooperation at the OPCW" as part of a series of speakers that earlier included Director-General Pfirter. Clingendael's Director, Dr. Jaap de Zwaan, chaired the event which included a small, but knowledgeable, group of participants from academia, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the City of The Hague and Clingendael staff. Three past and present Dutch Permanent Representatives to OPCW -- Marc Vogelaar, Maarten Lak and Pieter de Savornin Lohman -- all attended.

¶15. (U) Amb. Javits spoke extemporaneously from his personal experience, both at the Conference on Disarmament and at OPCW. Questions from participants focused on whether the experience of consensus at OPCW could be replicated elsewhere, the role of China and other rising powers in international organizations, the usefulness of the Cold War regional group structure in UN bodies, the prognosis for universality in the Chemical Weapons Convention and other arms control and non-proliferation treaties, and how The Hague might better support the international organizations resident in the city.

-----  
HOST COUNTRY COMMITTEE  
-----

¶16. (U) EC Chair Amb. Tomova (Slovakia) chaired the final meeting for the year of the Host Country Committee on December 15. She cited the Memorandum of Understanding on the Commissary signed on December 1, 2008, and requested the TS to provide an update on implementation. Serban Coman-Enescu (Protocol), chair of the Technical Secretariat's internal committee on the Commissary, reported that the newly chosen company to run the Commissary was having difficulty obtaining the proper permits from the Dutch government to operate at OPCW. Legal Advisor Onate described the competitive bidding process for the new supplier but noted OPCW's reluctance to sign a contract until they had the appropriate license. As the current will expire on January 1, 2009, the question was whether to close the Commissary or to extend the current contract temporarily. The Committee expressed its unhappiness at the delay and asked whether the Dutch representative, Amb. Rob

Zaagman, could assist in speeding up the process. They agreed that the current contractor should not continue, even if it meant shutting down the commissary for a time. There was also an animated discussion of parking spots for diplomats at Schiphol Airport and both train stations in The Hague. Since this is a broader issue than for OPCW alone, the Committee requested Amb. Tomova to coordinate with the Dean of the Diplomatic Corps in requesting additional spaces.

¶17. (SBU) Amb. Tomova closed the meeting by thanking Amb. Javits for his service and noting that WEOG would need to select a new representative to replace him. Amb. Javits responded that the U.S. had already requested that the succession be on WEOG's agenda for its first meeting in January. (Del Comment: Tomova's deputy had phoned before the meeting to alert us that this would be raised. Unfortunately, the Iranian representative was not present at the meeting for the object lesson on orderly succession of representatives upon the departure of an ambassador. End Comment.)

-----  
ABAF REFORM  
-----

¶18. (SBU) On December 18, Delreps met with Japanese delegate Takayuki Kitagawa and South Korean delegate Su-jin Cho to discuss ideas for reforming the OPCW's QSu-jin Cho to discuss ideas for reforming the OPCW's Advisory Body on Administrative and Financial Matters (ABAF). Kitagawa and Cho both serve on the ABAF, having taken over from their respective predecessors. According to Cho, a smaller group of real experts would be the best option for the ABAF to be effective. However, Kitagawa predicted that attempts to make any radical changes likely will be met with heavy resistance, and he suggested introducing gradual changes on a trial basis. Both Cho and Kitagawa agreed that the Geneva Group would be a good forum to further develop ideas for ABAF reform, especially in advance of the next EC session in February.

-----  
YEAR END 2008  
-----

¶19. (U) This will be the last wrap up for 2008. The U.S. Delegation wishes all our loyal readers happy holidays and best wishes for the new year.

¶20. (U) Beik sends.  
CULBERTSON